DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 913 CS 205 552

AUTHOR Holsberry, Carmen W.
TITLE Faulkner, Fitzgerald, and Pynchon: An Archetypal Approach to Modernism and Postmodernism in the Secondary School Curriculum.
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the combined Annual Meeting of the Secondary School English Conference and the Conference on English Education (Omaha, NE, March 27-29, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *English Instruction; *Literary History; *Literary Styles; *Modernism; Secondary Education; *Thematic Approach; Twentieth Century Literature; *United States Literature
IDENTIFIERS *Postmodernism

ABSTRACT

This paper suggests that teachers and curriculum planners should offer an overview of American fiction that presents the recurrent archetypes of American fiction and yet also deals with the unique aspects of individual works of fiction. The major pattern of experience in American fiction is explained as the transaction of the innocent self with the somewhat unyielding new world. Examples are given of this conflict of innocence with the world throughout American literature. Several protagonists in American literature are noted who innocently plant themselves against the world, insisting that life must have a meaning as they begin their existential quest for a new life, yet who encountered the intractability of a world that does not come round to them. Examples of such protagonists include Fitzgerald's Nick Carraway in "The Great Gatsby," Faulkner's Isaac McCaslin in "The Bear," and Pynchon's Oedipa Maas in "Lot 49." Emphasis is placed on examples from literature that differentiate between modernism, as found in Faulkner and Fitzgerald, and post modernism, exemplified by Pynchon, in order to show that despite the differences in form in twentieth century American Literature that students must be made aware of, there are also patterns in the American experience that are of recurrent, urgent, and ultimate concern for the American artist. (MKM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED186913

Dr. Carmen W. Holsberry
Chair, English Department
Newtown High School
Rte. 34,
Sandy Hook, Ct. 06482

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FAULKNER, FITZGERALD, AND PYNCHON: AN ARCHETYPAL APPROACH TO MODERNISM AND POSTMODERNISM IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM

The American artist, from his beginnings, has had the task unique in Western culture--at once daunting, awesome, and stimulating--of literally creating the forms of literature by which he could apprehend and give meaning to the experience on this new continent. From Emerson's admonishing the American artist to abandon the courtly muses of Europe and his statement that "Our day of independence, our long apprenticeship to the learning of other lands, draws to a close. The millions that around us are rushing into life, cannot always be fed on the sere remains of foreign harvests. Events, actions arise, that must be sung, that will sing themselves,"[1] through Pound's often-stated advice that the young moderns "Make it new!" to John Barth's recently published essay that calls for a new literature of replenishment which builds on and is a "synthesis or transcension of [the] anthitheses . . . [of] premodernist and modernist modes of writing,"[2] the teacher finds the artists themselves continually insisting on the creation of new forms of literature.

Thematically, also, this insistence on the new is pervasive. The teacher finds it at those moments which have become virtual paradigms of American literature: Hester Prynne meets Dimmesdale in a climactic forest scene and insists that they "Begin all anew!" She asks, "Hast thou exhausted possibility in the failure of this one trial? Not so! The future is yet full of trial and success."[3] James's Lambert Strether, suddenly alive in Gloriani's garden in Paris, declares, "Live all you

CS206552

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Carmen W. Holsberry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

can; it's a mistake not to"[4] as he attempts to become a new man. Fitzgerald's Gatsby, inventing a new persona out of a Platonic conception of himself, becomes "the hero as self-created innocent."[5] As the teacher considers recent fiction, she finds Ellison's nameless protagonist, or Bellow's Augie March, or Pynchon's Oedipa Maas all seeking what Malamud's Helen Bober desires when she says, "I want a larger and better life. I want the return of my possibilities,"[6] and all searching for that dream which is the title of another Malamud novel, A New Life. These contemporary works are, in R. W. B. Lewis's words, "novels in each of which the hero is willing, with marvelously inadequate equipment, to take on as much of the world as is available to him, without ever fully submitting to any of the world's determining categories."[7] All these fictional characters might have been listening as Emerson addressed the young American scholars and told them "that if the single man plant himself indomitably on his instincts, and there abide, the huge world will come round to him . . . with shades of all the good and great for company; and for solace, the perspective of your own infinite life."[8] Malamud's Helen Bober evokes this Emersonian motif, when to the sarcastic and materialistic question "What do you wanna be--Miss Rheingold?" the reader is told that "she wanted to make herself a better person, have bigger ideas, live a more worthwhile life . . . . Life has to have some meaning."[9] Socially and chronologically, the distance from Emerson's Harvard Yard to Malamud's ghetto is great, but the spiritual journey undertaken is the same. And between these two seeming polarities, one finds those protagonists who, with those mentioned above, constitute the great and central tradition of American literature: Young Goodman Brown, Robin Molineux, Redburn, Pierre, Billy Budd, Daisy Miller, Isabel Archer, Huck Finn, Henry Fleming, Nick Adams, and Isaac McCaslin. They all,

innocently, plant themselves indomitably against the huge world; they all abide there with their belief in their lives of infinite possibility; they all insist that life has to have a meaning as they begin their existential quest for a new life. Yet they all encounter the sheer intractability of this huge world which does not come round to them. It is this transaction--psychological, spiritual, metaphysical--of the innocent self with the world which forms the major pattern of experience in American fiction.

It has been necessary to begin by emphasizing this continuum in American literature because an awareness of this archetypal pattern makes it easier to discuss some of the problems faced by the secondary school teacher; it also makes it easier to offer some initiatives for the American literature curriculum planner. There are two specific problems for the planner. The first is that of the teacher either failing to comprehend this continuity of the patterns of American fiction or failing to convey this coherence to students if he or she does realize it exists. The second problem, in a sense the obverse of the first, is that of identifying for students the characteristics of individual works of fiction as they exemplify periods within the continuum of American literature. With these two problems in mind, that of conveying a general continuity and that of recognizing works' particularity, the teacher and curriculum planner are faced with a dilemma: how can they offer an overview of American literature which presents the recurrent archetypes of American fiction in an intellectually coherent manner, on the one hand, and still deal with the individual work of fiction in all its uniqueness, on the other?

I would like to offer a method of solving this dilemma by discussing a contemporary novel, Thomas Pynchon's The Crying of Lot 49 and by

placing it in the continuum of the archetype of the innocent American facing the world. Contemporary works are used in English classrooms, but it is doubtful if the criteria for choosing them are either well-defined to the teacher or well-articulated to the students. Teachers tend to assign works by Hemingway, Faulkner, and Fitzgerald from the 1920's and works by Heller, Vonnegut, and Updike from the 1960's and then to subsume them all in that rather vague category called modern fiction. It is obvious that there are differences between the aesthetics and metaphysics of the two periods, but they are often overlooked rather than sharply defined. To appreciate Pynchon's Lot 49 and other recent works--whether they are called contemporary or post-modern--and to discern their place in the American continuum, some of the differences between modern and postmodern literature must be considered.

II.

Harry Levin's essay "What Was Modernism?" gives a sense of the chronological context of modernism by his use of the past tense in his title. Making a clear distinction between the modern and postmodern periods and perceiving "with increasing clarity, that the modernistic movement comprises one of the most remarkable constellations of genius in the history of the West,"[10] Levin places the efflorescence of modernism in the 1920's and sees its apex as 1922, the year of publication of both Ulysses and The Waste Land, as well as important works by Lawrence, Virginia Woolf, Yeats, Valery, Brecht, and Rilke. If we limit our view to the American scene, we see Fitzgerald beginning to publish in 1920 with This Side of Paradise and Hemingway with in our time in 1924.

In 1925, as an example of this ferment, we encounter Dos Passos's Manhattan Transfer, Dreiser's An American Tragedy, Lewis's Arrowsmith, and Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby. In fact, the decade of 1919 to 1929, which begins with Anderson's Winesburg, Ohio and climaxes with the triumvirate of Faulkner's The Sound and the Fury, Wolfe's Look Homeward, Angel, and Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms, encompasses most what is now considered to be the great modern American achievement in fiction. If we add to this important works in poetry by Crane, Tate, Frost, Cummings, Stevens, and Eliot, and the drama of O'Neill, we begin to realize the significance of the decade as the height of modernism. Indeed, only the years 1850-55, which saw the publication of The Scarlet Letter, Moby Dick, Walden, and Leaves of Grass, can compare with these years. However, a chronological approach does little more than locate the achievement; it does not define or characterize it. Although he does not elaborate greatly in discussing "the Zeitgeist they shared," Levin does mention a key to understanding the great moderns, their "awareness of chronology."[11] In an early and important study of Faulkner which relates directly to this consideration of American fiction, Jean-Paul Sartre isolates this awareness as the key to Faulkner's work:

> A fictional technique always relates back to the novelist's metaphysics. The critic's task is to define the latter before evaluating the former. Now, it is immediately obvious that Faulkner's metaphysics is a metaphysics of time.
>
> Man's misfortune lies in his beirg time-bound.[12]

Sartre realizes this relationship in Faulkner's works of the past and present is what gives them their great complexity. He also realizes that Faulkner's method is common to all the great modern novelists:

> The basic reason for this relationship [of past and present] is to be found in a very general literary phenomenon. Most

> of the great contemporary authors, Proust, Joyce, Dos Passos, Faulkner, Gide, and Virginia Woolf have tried, each in his own way, to distort time. 13

By distortion, Sartre means that Faulkner and his contemporaries do not follow the normal logical or chronological sequence of events in their works. Looking back on the moderns, one can see it is this transformation of chronology, this wresting of time to yield a dramatic new form for fiction, that is their most pervasive innovation.

Teachers also face the problem of explaining Faulkner's distortion of time when they teach him. For example, The Bear, often taught on the secondary school level, has as its main narrative sequence the initiation into manhood of Isaac McCaslin from roughly his sixteenth to his twenty-first birthday. It is a compelling narrative of a hunt, of a young man's growing psychic awareness of the meaning and identification with Nature. Yet, the full symbolic meaning is not revealed until the fourth section of the story. In it, the narrative sequence ceases and Isaac begins a complex contrapuntal movement from present to past and back again. He learns, from old business records and family diaries, that his life has meaning only as it relates to the past of his family; and that past is one which contains slavery, miscegenation, incest, and theft of the land. The reader then sees Isaac in what amounts to a symbolic moral dialectic with time: he realizes that he must accept his complicity in the past sins of his family and that he can expiate these sins only by renouncing his patrimony, his future. As Isaac's awareness of his complicity grows, he realizes that the sins of the past are not just those of his family, but of all the dominant white race which has exploited the land, just as it has cheated the Indians and enslaved the Blacks. Thus, the

teacher is able to demonstrate to students that a story which begins as that of a hunt and individual initiation ends with the embodiment of the concept of the American continent as a pristine Eden capable of providing man with a new, sinless life. Yet, the students learn, as does Isaac, that this new land of hope, this pre-lapsarian Garden, has been violated by the Old Adam in us all; and they learn this through an understanding of Faulkner's symbolic use of time. The story moves, as does all great literature, from the individual to the mythic, from a hunting story, compelling as that story is, to an expression of the archetype of American civilization on this continent.

Fitzgerald's Nick Carraway has much the same view of the Edenic promise of this new world and the new life possible in it, when, standing on Long Island, he sees America as it was seen by the first Dutch sailors:

> . . . a fresh, green breast of the new world. . . . [it] pandered in whispers to the last and greatest of all human dreams; for a transitory enchanted moment man must have held his breath in the presence of this continent . . . face to face for the last time in history with something commensurate to his capacity for wonder. [14]

Yet Nick arrives at this view, at novel's end, only after he is able to piece together the disjointed fragments which explain Gatsby's life. Nick's comprehension of the meaning of America is simultaneous with his realization "of the significance of Gatsby's dream. There is first the identification of his dream with the dream of those who discovered and settled the American continent. . .; there is next the association of Gatsby's dream with the dream of Modern America . . .; there is finally the poignant realization that all of these dreams are one and inseparable and forever without our grasp. . . ."[15] Fitzgerald's

technique for presenting the meaning of Gatsby's American dream and Nick's understanding of it is the technique he learned from Conrad's various uses of Marlow as narrator. James E. Miller has shown how Fitzgerald presents apparently unrelated events and selected incidents in a manner which distorts the normal chronological sequence in order to heighten dramatic suspense and to identify Gatsby with the myth of America. Miller lists the significant chronological events of Gatsby's life as A, B, C, D, and E; yet, he demonstrates that Nick and the reader learn of the meaning of Gatsby's life as C, B, C, C, D, E, A.[16] It is only after Gatsby's death that Nick learns of Gatsby's boyhood dreams (events Miller labels A); they are a combination of Benjamin Franklin and Horatio Alger, progenitors of the American dream of success. Nick's insights into America and Gatsby--ultimately the two are one--allow him to understand the meaning of both:

> The truth was that Jay Gatsby of West Egg, Long Island, sprang from his Platonic conception of himself. He was a son of God--a phrase which, if it means anything, means just that--and he must be about His Father's business, the service of a vast, vulgar, and meretricious beauty. So he invented just the sort of Jay Gatsby that a seventeen-year-old boy would be likely to invent, and to this conception he was faithful to the end. 17

This distortion of time in order to present symbolic and mythic meaning is the predominant technique of both Faulkner and Fitzgerald in these two works. It is a method which T. S. Eliot had described, just two years before the publication of Gatsby, as being Ulysses's major contribution to the form of the modern novel:

> In using the myth, in manipulating a continuous parallel between contemporaneity and antiquity, Mr. Joyce is pursuing a method which others must pursue after him. . . . It is simply a way of controlling, of ordering, of giving a shape and a significance to the immense panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history. 18

The method he describes in Joyce's Ulysses is also that of his own The Waste Land. It is significant that on the publication of Gatsby in 1925, Eliot wrote Fitzgerald that he had read his novel three times and that "it seems to me to be such a remarkable book. In fact it seems to me to be the first step that American fiction has taken since Henry James."[19] Eliot evidently appreciated the technique, characterized above as the distortion of time in order to present symbolic and mythic meaning, he found in Fitzgerald's novel. Mark Schorer has given an excellent summary of this change in the novel's form which Eliot was the first to notice:

> Under the "immense artistic preoccupations" of James and Conrad and Joyce, the form of the novel changed, and with the technical change, analogous changes took place in substance, in point of view, in the whole conception of fiction. And the final lesson of the modern novel is that technique is not the secondary thing that it seemed. . . , some external machination, a mechanical affair, but a deep and primary operation; not only that technique contains intellectual and moral implications, but that it discovers them. 20

The title of Schorer's essay, "Technique as Discovery," serves well as a brief critical statement of the whole aesthetic revolution described above. There are probably other aspects of modernist innovation in fiction to present to students, but the technique discussed here in the works of Faulkner and Fitzgerald--the manipulation of time and point of view to discover symbolic and mythic meaning--is both the representative and the predominant technique of the modernist masters.

It is necessary for the teacher to comprehend the methods of the moderns if she is to understand and to present the context of postmodernism. In some ways, postmodernism is an extension of modernism; in others, it represents a conscious break or rebellion. Yet, ultimately, the literature discussed here from both periods can be subsumed under the larger archetype of the innocent, single self against the world.

III.

In 1967, the year after Pynchon published The Crying of Lot 49, John Barth complained of "the used-upness of certain forms or exhaustion of certain possibilities . . . . That a great many Western artists for a great many years have quarrelled with received definitions of artistic media, genres, and forms goes without saying."[21] Philip Stevick has seen a more open break with the recent past than Barth's sense of exhaustion and has concluded "that this sense of discontinuity with the dominant figures of modernism is one of the few qualities that unite new fiction. . . . What recent fiction tells us on every page is that it is of another age than the modernist masters."[22]

The first two sentences of Lot 49 illustrate this sense of being of "another age":

> One summer afternoon Mrs. Oedipa Maas came home from a Tupperware party whose hostess had put perhaps too much kirsch in the fondue to find that she, Oedipa, had been named executor, or she supposed executrix, of the estate of one Pierce Inverarity, a California real estate mogul who had once lost two million dollars in his spare time but still had assets numerous and tangled enough to make the job of sorting it all out more than honorary. Oedipa stood in the living room, stared at by the greenish dead eye of the TV tube, spoke the name of God, tried to feel as drunk as possible. 23

The first thing that strikes the reader is Pynchon's use of, indeed immersion in, the artifacts of popular culture: Tupperware and TV and fondue and the echo of best-selling "how to" books on real estate. As the novel progresses, one encounters the complete panorama of modern Southern California culture: freeways, shopping centers, subdivisions, rock groups, child movie stars, and cartoons on the ubiquitous television. The most obvious contrast between the modern and the postmodern is the vastly different imagery used to convey

experience. Pynchon's popular artifacts need only be compared with Faulkner's traditional nature imagery in The Bear, or that of Nick's description of Long Island cited above, or Hemingway's natural description raised to the symbolic found throughout his work, to see this difference. Pynchon has certainly followed Barth's formula for the postmodern artist who, discontented with traditional forms, has turned to "pop art, dramatic and musical 'happenings,' the whole range of 'intermedia' or 'mixed-means' art."[24] Although Pynchon is a serious and sophisticated artist, he does not exhibit an attitude of disdain and irony toward his material from popular culture that one finds in, for example, Eliot's use of similar material in his poetry. Pynchon's novel is a prime example of Stevick's observation that "new fiction contains and often intensifies the tendency in most fiction of any period to assimilate and transform the bad art of its own time."[25] Rather than condescending, Pynchon virtually revels in cultural kitsch. Yet, the key words in Stevick's observation--assimilate and transform--are necessary both to understand Pynchon's art and to present it to students. If the teacher sees only the surface of his method, she will be tempted to do nothing more in the classroom than talk about similarities with Pop Art and such phenomena as Warhol's soup cans, paintings of Marilyn Monroe, comic books, and other examples of camp. Pynchon uses popular material, but thoroughly assimilates and transforms it.

In his opening sentences cited above, he transforms kitsch into metaphysical and epistemological concepts. In the second sentence, she speaks the "name of God," but has as a response only "the greenish dead eye of the TV tube" (p. 1). As she progresses in her search for the meaning and scope of Inverarity's estate, she has moments, such as

that when she first sees the real estate development of San Narcisco, which are those of religious epiphany. She has "a revelation . . . just past the threshold of her understanding . . . of an odd, religious instant" (p. 13). Yet, in the last paragraph of the novel, she still is "trying to guess, to find "her proof" as the auctioneer "spread his arms in a gesture that seemed to belong to the priesthood of some remote culture; perhaps to a descending angel" (p. 138). Oedipa's metaphysical search--the form of the novel is definitely a religious quest--has opened to her the possibilities of life that Malamud's Helen Bober had fervently wished for; but the possibilities Oedipa finds are either inconclusive or terrifying. Like Sophocles's Oedipus Rex, "who . . . is tormented by the question of man's place in a universe he does not understand,"[26] Oedipa encounters inexplicable riddles concerning man's destiny, and she is forced, like him, to continue her quest in the face of uncertainty. In the first sentence, when Pynchon says Oedipa has "the job of sorting it all out" (p. 1), he is referring to Inverarity's estate, which by novel's end has become all of America. This first mention of sorting of information, Oedipa's task on her quest, is also related to the scientific theory of refuting the entropy posited in the second law of thermodynamics by means of the concept of Maxwell's Demon, an invention of the nineteenth-century physicist, James Clerk Maxwell. One critic's explanation of this theory is that

> As the Demon sorts the molecules, he increases order . . . and decreases the entropy, or amount of disorder in the system. . . . Pynchon uses Maxwell's notion of the Demon as a metaphor for Oedipa's experiences. The frequent allusions to Oedipa's sorting masses of information evoke the idea of Maxwell's sorting Demon. . . . she tends to view the Demon in terms of the poles of order and randomness. The Demon, as Oedipa sees it, establishes a point of order and connection in a system of random occurrences. 27

Order and randomness constitute the parameters within which Oedipa's quest takes place. She learns that "there are two distinct kinds of this entropy. One having to do with heat-engines, the other to do with communication" (p. 77). Increased entropy in the physical world leads to inertia and disorder, the horrifying concept of the universe "running down" which Pynchon brilliantly symbolizes in a scene with a can of hair spray gone berserk. In American society, however, the opposite is true. Inverarity, symbolic of the arch capitalist, has temporarily defeated entropy. He has imposed a restricting physical order on the American countryside by imposing the patterns and grids of real estate development on the natural order, and he has imposed a constricting psychic order on the employees of his giant corporation. Thus, from an opening paragraph that seemingly describes the artifacts of popular culture, Pynchon introduces concepts--of a religious quest, of the nature of the physical universe, of theories of communication, of the nature of American society--that are of ultimate concern.

Oedipa, the innocent suburban housewife, begins a quest in search of Inverarity's estate, and realizes that "his legacy was America" (p. 134). She also gradually perceives that it is a sterile, wasteland America which has cut itself off from the possibilities of human life and growth. At the end of the novel, she can only ask "how had it ever happened here, with the chances once so good for diversity?" (p. 136).

IV.

Oedipa's plaintive "how did it ever happen here?" is a question asked by Faulkner's Isaac McCaslin as he sees the death of the wilderness at the hands of the encroaching lumber company in nineteenth-century

Mississippi. It is also Nick Carraway's question as he surveys the ruined lives on twentieth-century Long Island. The question all these characters ask has its genesis in the conflict Hawthorne presented in seventeenth-century Massachusetts in his "The May-Pole of Merry Mount" when he states, "Jollity and gloom were contending for an empire."[28] Merry Mount's setting is one of Edenic innocence as Hawthorne depicts the first symbolic Adamic fall on America's shores. Hawthorne's triumphant Puritans are described as men of iron who suppress the emotions and restrict the possibilities of life. He suggests, but not approvingly, that perhaps such men are necessary to found the American empire. The result, however, over three centuries later, is the psychic wasteland of Southern California presided over by Pierce Inverarity, the equally spiritually constricting descendant of the Puritans. The conflict Hawthorne first depicts and which becomes a pattern in American fiction is that between those innocents who are constantly seeking a new life, spiritual rebirth, life's possibilities, and those forces in American society who constantly restrain, thwart, frustrate, and deaden. This is the pattern shown in Emerson's advice that if the individual stand alone relying on his instincts, the "huge world will come round to him." It is a pattern repeated throughout American fiction down to such a contemporary as Thomas Pynchon.

What should be emerging, then, and what can be conveyed to students, is that there are broad patterns, or archetypes, in fiction.[29] If American literature is viewed with the unifying archetype of the American innocent in mind, the teacher should be able to perceive a unity which she can present to students. However, a note of caution against oversimplification or making unique works of art fit a Procrustean Bed is in order. This archetype of American innocents against the world is

broad enough to allow the teacher to present to students its many variations in both short fiction and novels.

Finally, much time has been spent differentiating between modernism and post-modernism in order to show that despite the differences in form in 20th century American literature--and these are differences the students must be made aware of--that there are patterns in the American experience which are of recurrent, urgent, and ultimate concern for the American artist.

Notes

[1] Ralph Waldo Emerson, "The American Scholar" in The American Tradition in Literature, ed. Sculley Bradley, et. al. (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1974), p. 597.

[2] John Barth, "The Literature of Replenishment," Atlantic Monthly, vol. 245, no. 1 (January, 1980), p. 70.

[3] Nathaniel Hawthorne, The Scarlet Letter in The Scarlet Letter and Selected Tales, ed. Thomas E. Connolly (New York: Penguin Books, 1970), p. 215.

[4] Henry James, The Ambassadors (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1964), p. 132.

[5] R. W. B. Lewis, The American Adam; Innocence, Tragedy, and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), p. 197.

[6] Bernard Malamud, The Assistant (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1971), p. 49.

[7] Lewis, p. 198.

[8] Emerson, p. 612.

[9] Malamud, pp. 49-50.

[10] Harry Levin, "What Was Modernism?" in Refractions; Essays in Comparative Literature (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 284.

[11] Ibid., pp. 284-285.

[12] Jean-Paul Sartre, "On The Sound and the Fury: Time in the Works of Faulkner" in Faulkner; a Collection of Critical Essays, ed. Robert Penn Warren (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p. 87.

[13] Ibid., p. 91.

[14] F. Scott Fitzgerald, The Great Gatsby (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 182.

[15] James E. Miller, Jr., F. Scott Fitzgerald, His Art and His Technique (New York: New York University Press, 1967), pp. 122-123.

[16] Ibid., pp. 112-114.

[17] Fitzgerald, p. 99.

[18] T. S. Eliot, "Ulysses, Order, and Myth" in Critiques and Essays on Modern Fiction, ed. John W. Aldridge (New York: The Ronald Press, 1952), p. 426.

[19] T. S. Eliot, "Three Letters about The Great Gatsby" in The Crack-Up, ed. Edmund Wilson (New York: New Directions, 1945), p. 310.

[20] Mark Schorer, "Technique As Discovery" in Critiques and Essays on Modern Fiction, p. 72.

[21] John Barth, "The Literature of Exhaustion" in The Novel Today, ed. Malcolm Bradbury (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1977), p. 70. This essay first appeared in Atlantic Monthly, August, 1967.

[22] Philip Stevick, "Scheherezade runs out of plots, goes on talking; the King, puzzled, listens: an Essay on New Fiction" in The Novel Today, pp. 191-192.

[23] Thomas Pynchon, The Crying of Lot 49 (New York: Bantam Books, 1967), p. 1. Hereafter page numbers are given in the text.

[24] Barth, p. 70.

[25] Stevick, p. 209.

[26] Joseph W. Slade, Thomas Pynchon (New York: Warner Communications, 1974), p. 126.

[27] Anne Mangel, "Maxwell's Demon, Entropy, Information: The Crying of Lot 49" in Mindful Pleasures, Essays on Thomas Pynchon, ed. George Levine and David Leverenz (Boston: Little, Brown, 1976), p. 88.

[28] Nathaniel Hawthorne, "The May-Pole of Merry Mount" in The Scarlet Letter and Selected Tales, p. 287.

[29] I mean by archetypes nothing more esoteric than Northrop Frye's definition that they are symbols which recur in literature, and he defines symbol as any unit of literary meaning, including narrative, character, and imagery. See Northrop Frye, On Teaching Literature (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972), p. 31.